

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

By the foregoing amendment, claims 1 and 4 have been amended, and claims 3 and 6 have been canceled. Thus, claims 1-2, and 4-5 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

I. Objection to Claim 4

In the Office Action mailed November 20, 2006, the Examiner objected to claim 4 for informalities. Claim 4 has been amended responsive to this rejection.

II. Claim Rejection

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,428,565 to Smith ("Smith"). It is noted that claims 3 and 6 have been canceled, and claims 1 and 4 have been amended. To the extent that the rejection remains applicable to the claims currently pending, the Applicants hereby traverse the rejection, as follows.

Applicants' invention as now set forth in claim 1 is directed to a resolution conversion method for converting color data output from a single-plate-type color-image sensor into data of a predetermined resolution and at the same time, processing the color data so that the pixel positions of respective colors coincide with each other, wherein plural processes to convert the color data into different resolutions are stored in advance and some of the plural processes are selected and executed according to an external direction.

The Office Action asserts that Smith teaches a method in which a resolution conversion and a simultaneous processing are simultaneously carried out, citing column 6, lines 11-30. In Smith, the resolution is determined by a density of selected pixels. Thus, the resolution conversion is carried out by selection of pixels. Thus, the resolution conversion processing that converts the data of each pixel into data of the predetermined resolution, as recited in claim 1, is not carried out. Therefore, the simultaneous processing and resolution, as recited in claim 1, are not carried out simultaneously, as also recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Smith describes, in column 6, lines 37-39, that this selection of pixels for a different resolution simplifies the image processing for the rest of the image chain (simultaneous processing) because the same algorithms can be used regardless of the selected image resolution.

In addition, the Office Action asserts that Smith discloses that plural processes to convert the color data into different resolutions are stored in advance and some are selected and executed in an external direction. Smith describes switch 88b allowing a user to select the image record size. (See Smith column 6, lines 11-30). However, this referenced section does not disclose or suggest that plural processes to convert color data into different resolutions are stored in advance and selected, as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art. As claim 1 is allowable, the Applicants submit that claim 2, which depends from allowable claim 1, is therefore also allowable for at least the above noted reasons and for the additional subject matter recited therein.

As discussed above regarding claim 1, Smith does not disclose or suggest a pixel data processing circuit including at least a resolution conversion/simultaneous processing circuit that performs simultaneously resolution conversion processing and simultaneous processing and that stores plural processes to convert the color data into different resolutions and selects and executes some of the plural processes according to a direction from the outside, as recited in claim 4.

For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claim 4, as amended, is allowable over the cited art. As claim 4 is allowable, the Applicants submit that claim 5, which depends from allowable claim 4, is therefore also allowable for at least the above noted reasons and for the additional subject matter recited therein.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into condition for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge

Application No. 10/613,124
Attorney Docket No. 100021-00127

any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to

Deposit Account No. 01-2300 with reference to Attorney Docket No. 100021-00127.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sheree T. Rowe". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Sheree" being more prominent than the last name "Rowe".

Sheree T. Rowe
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 59,068

Customer No. 004372
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 715-8492
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395